

**O'HARE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT
MASTER PLAN REVIEW
FAA COMMENTS/ CITY RESPONSE**

December 3, 2004

**D-PROJECT DEFINITION REPORT, CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT/REFINEMENT REPORT,
AND AIRSIDE SIMULATION ANALYSIS**

General Note: FAA comment text has been abbreviated. For comment in its entirety please see Appendix C, FAA "Master Plan Review" of September 6, 2004. All sections referenced in the "Response" column pertain to the O'Hare International Airport Master Plan (MP)

Reference No.	Comment	Response
D-1	Pg 6 PDR potential land-use between close spaced N RW - cross-field roadway requires airspace review	The master planning process demonstrated that the Cross Airfield Roadway illustrated on Master Plan Exhibit VI-17 is not required to accommodate the forecast demand over the next 20 years. As such, the Cross Airfield Roadway is not a project in the Master Plan's Preferred Alternative and not shown on the Future ALP.
D-2	Pg 7 para 3.1.2 states TW Q off RW 22R...should be 22L	Discrepancy noted
D-3	Pg 8 PDR 10C/28C penetrate Part 77-Clarify RW will be raised, if not, what are Part 77 penetrations? 9 or 45 light poles	See discussion in Master Plan (M.P.) Section 6.1.1.5.
D-4	PDR ADG VI access 28C hold pad via TW S upgraded to ADG VI width (pg 8). Under what operational use? Ex V-33	6.1.1.7, Exhibit VI-3 - Subsequent to modeling airfield operations for the Master Plan, TAAM modeling was used for EIS simulation in accordance with FAA and addressees the most recent Air Traffic procedures.

D-5	Pg 9 Why would raising 10R to mitigate Part 77 be undesirable? How are costs significant not to raise?	6.1.1.6 - Runway 10R-28L runway end elevations are shown to conform to FAA TERPS criteria. Runway end elevations for RW 10R-28L will be reviewed/refined during the project's design/engineering phase. As part of the design phase, a detailed engineering study will include operational characteristics, cost, schedule and environmental in determining optimal runway end elevations.
D-6	Pg 9 TW S restrict /control during ops on RW 10R/28L. What is impact on overall airport? Alternatives to restriction?	See response to Comment D-4.
D-7	RW use for ADG VI aircraft during inboard departures IFR East/West flow? Ex V-35, V-37 Airside Sim Rpt	See response to Comment D-4.
D-8	ADG VI taxi to/from SW Cargo? Traffic impacts? Ex9 PDR NLA will access east air cargo via T12 (TW width ADGVI?)	6.1.1.7, Exhibit VI-3 - T12 width has been increased from 75' to 100' on the Future ALP - October, 2003. Taxiways have been provided for ADG-VI aircraft to transition to/from Runways 9C-27C and 10C-28C. Traffic impacts will be determined through EIS simulation.
D-9	Pg 26 Para 4 PDR W. by-pass I90 I294 & ext Elgin O'Hare express, EIS type amount of traffic, Part 77 review	These non-airport roads are under the jurisdiction of other state agencies. If and when design plans for these roads are developed, such plans will be made available to the FAA wherever appropriate.
D-10	Pg 26 Para 4.3 PDR push-back areas W side of satellite concourse (213' for ADGVI) shows 212' on Exhibit 16	Exhibit revised to reflect 213' for pushback area
D-11	Pg 27 Para 4.3 PDR discusses W Term accommodating 15 jumbo. Should also discuss accommodating NLA	6.2.3 – West Terminal is planned to accommodate NLA.
D-12	Pg 53 Sect 8.1 PDR Sect 5.4 CDR inconsistent with ALP. Text-relo B. Ditch, RR, Irv Park; ALP depicts park lot	Future ALP – October, 2003 - The parking lot is located adjacent to and northeast of the relocated Bensenville Ditch
D-13	PDR sked W Concourse to open 2009. Before secure people mover available? (Pg 73, Pg 80 PDR)	Discussion in M.P. Sections 6.5 and 7.1.4.
D-14	Sect IV Concept Develop Rpt. Any anticipated needs of current and future tenants?	Potential growth for existing and future tenants may be accommodated in "Future Aviation Development" areas

O'Hare International Airport
DRAFT #1

		as provided on the ALP.
D-15	CDR Sect 5.2 and 5.2.1.3 should consider design of W. Terminal access to prevent future cost when develop W. Bypass	Comment noted.
D-16	Pg II-8 CDR "Advisory Sessions held with FAA, airlines, and others..." Identify whom "others" include.	Others include the City and those designated as representatives of the FAA, airlines and City

CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT/REFINEMENT REPORT

General Note: *FAA comment text has been abbreviated. For comment in its entirety please see Appendix D, FAA "Master Plan Review" of September 6, 2004. All sections referenced in the "Response" column pertain to the O'Hare International Airport Master Plan (MP)*

Reference No.	Comment	Response
A-1	Provide justification on why a 13 knot allowable crosswind was used when Airport Design Group A-1 and B-1, which consist of 0.6% of the operation has an allowable crosswind of 10.5 knots	4.1.2.1 - The desirable wind coverage for an airport is 95% usability based on the total number of weather operations. For a maximum crosswind component of 10.5 knots, the wind coverage is 96.3%. See M.P. Table IV-3 "Wind Coverage" R/W 9-27 & R/W 4-22.
A-2	Under precipitation the Runway 9-27 & 4-22 combination only has 94.0% wind coverage both during the daytime operating hours and all hours analysis. In accordance with Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5300-13, Airport Design, the criteria is 95 percent for total wind observations. Provide information in the text on how the proposed configuration meets this standard. (See comment A-1)	See response to comment A-1

***O'Hare International Airport
DRAFT #1***

A-3	Provide additional data to justify why it is acceptable that none of the orientation meet 95 percent coverage for 10.5 knots crosswind	4.1.2.1 - Runway 9-27 & 4-22 coverage for the total number of weather operations during the operating hours of 0600-2200 is 96.3% and 98.9% for a maximum allowable crosswind of 10.5 knots and 13 knots respectively. See M.P. Table IV-3 "Wind Coverage".
A-4	Verify when the New Large Aircraft (NLA) will begin commercial service at O'Hare International Airport and provide consistency throughout all of the O'Hare Modernization Program (OMP) planning documents (Project Definition, Unconstrained Demand Analysis, and Airside Simulation Analysis Report), 2006 or 2009.	4.1.2 - Airbus introduction of A380-800 into commercial service is expected in 2006. A380-800 operations into O'Hare is not expected during 2006 however is expected prior to 2009.

A-5	Verify the length required for the NLA and provide consistency throughout all of the OMP planning documents.	4.1.2.2 - Runway length requirements for NLA are based on Airbus A380 specifications.
A-6	NLA are shown in the Project Definition Report to only have parking positions available at the Western Terminal and West Satellite Terminal, not at the International Terminal 5 of the new international arrival facilities (assuming to be Terminal 2 under World Gateway Program (WGP)).	6.2 - Based on number of NLA in the forecast, gates are only allocated for the West Terminal however, crossover ADG-VI taxiways from Runway 10C-28C parallel taxiway (ADG VI) are provided for access to gates located at Terminal 5 and 6, as well as the existing core area to support future optional parking capability and NLA operations prior to opening of the West Terminal.
A-7	Verify runway length needed for NLA.	See response to Comment A-5 and M.P. Table IV-4.
A-8	Verify the length needed by the most demanding aircraft, under the most demanding condition. It appears to be 12,250 feet. If this is the requirement and aircraft performance is improving, how and why justify a 13,000-foot runway with declared distances?	4.1.2.2 - Airline representatives indicate a preference to preserve existing max field length of 13,000 feet.
A-9	Last sentence: "Based on manufacturer's information, new ADG VI runways with departure lengths greater than 10,300 feet should be provided where practicable." Runway 10C/28C must use declared distances to provide a standard safety area when Design Group VI aircraft are on Taxiway S. This still provides a length of 10,543 feet. Please provide information why declared distances are used in order to maintain 10,600 feet of departure and arrival length on Runway 28C, when according to all the information presented in this document, the manufacturer reports greater than 10,300 feet are needed where practicable. Provide the practicability for using declared distance to gain 300 feet, when it is a design provision only to be used on a prior constrained runway.	Future ALP of October 2003 - The configuration of this runway has changed based on a review completed during the ALP revision. Threshold has moved back to the edge of pavement, providing a runway length of 10,800' thus maximizing runway length. Declared distances are still required to reduce the landing distance available on 10C in order to maintain a full safety area during arrival operations and allow simultaneous taxiing on Taxiway S.
A-10	"Departure Runways are 27C, 28C, and Runway 22L." In the text Runway 22L should be identified as a secondary departure runway.	5.1.1.2, Option 2 - Subsequent to modeling for purposes of the Master Plan, an EIS TAAM modeling was conducted in accordance with FAA. The simulation incorporates the most recent Air Traffic assumptions with operational results studied. For results, see latest EIS TAAM Data Package.
A-11	Throughout Section II, provide consistent text to describe Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval prior to IFR and VFR quad operations	5.1 - See response to Comment A-10.
A-12	Throughout Section II, provide consistent text when identifying the secondary	5.1.1.2, Option 2 - revised text.

	overflow, departure or arrival runway.	Also see response to Comment A-10.
A-13	Option 4, second to last sentence; "Departures occur on Runway 27C, 28C, and 22L." In text, Runway 22L should be identified as a secondary departure runway.	5.1.1.4, Option 4 - revised text. Also see response to Comment A-10.
A-14	Option 5; clarify this section. Was Option 5 the base case or one of the options put forth for review and consideration that thus became the preferred option? What does Option 5 consist of, provide text as provided in Option 1-5.	Option 5 is the Base Concept and is described in M.P. Section 5.1.1.
A-15	The last two sentences of this paragraph discuss the original intent to provide 10,000 feet on Runway 9C/27C. ATCT indicated the desire to cross aircraft behind the departing aircraft so a length of 11,245 feet was provided. Does this length take into consideration the need for NLA to have 10,300 feet for departure?	In most cases, intersection departure runway length will be sufficient for aircraft payload range. However in those situations where additional runway length is required, full runway departure length will be available.
A-16	Describe how the south airfield is more suitable to be designed for Aircraft Design Group (ADG) VI aircraft guidelines given that the existing terminal area essentially "opens" to the south. Why is this a planning factor since the Project Definition Report (PDR) shows all ADG VI aircraft located in the Western Terminal complex?	EIS TAAM Simulation See response to Comment A-10
A-17	Last sentence; how do the departing South America flights affect traffic flow?	EIS TAAM Simulation See response to Comment A-10.
A-18	Provide additional information on the potential congestion that exists between Runway 27C and 27L for ADG VI aircraft and the solution for this situation.	EIS TAAM Simulation See response to Comment A-10.
A-19	Provide additional information on the potential congestion that exists at the end of Runway 10L/28R and Runway 10C/28C because of runway crossings required for ADG VI aircraft and the solution for this situation.	EIS TAAM Simulation See response to Comment A-10.
A-20	Reevaluate taxiway flow for ADG VI aircraft, according to the PDR they do not having parking areas designated in Terminal 5.	EIS TAAM Simulation See response to Comment A-10.
A-21	If the taxi flows depicted in exhibit I-40 are correct, aircraft landing on Runway 9C, would also have to cross Runway 10L and Runway 10C in order to reach Terminal 5 (see comment A-20).	EIS TAAM Simulation See response to Comment A-10.
A-22	The assumption about the use of the parallel taxiway during Category II/III	Operational assumptions will be applied referencing

O'Hare International Airport
DRAFT #1

	approaches when there is a runway/taxiway separation of 400 feet is incorrect. At no time can an ADG V aircraft be on any portion of the taxiway while another aircraft occupies the runway and vice versa. (See Draft ALP comment A-48 issued May 21, 2003.)	Aeronautical Study 2003-AGL-0878-NRA of July 22, 2004; Appendix C; FAA letter dated April 8, 2004 Re: Runway/Parallel Taxiway Separation Guidance & Update on the Status of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13; Change 8
A-23	Why did the study use "terminal gate facilities to support operations at the highest demand level to allow for a full analysis of the airfield capacity without gate constraints". Explain the gate capacity used and if additional gates are needed beyond Planned Activity Level (PAL) 1 and PAL 2.	Described in M.P. Sections 4.2.1 and 5.2.1.
A-24	Based on accessibility to the southern most runway, verify the ability to achieve peak hour departure and arrival numbers (see Draft ALP comment B-95 issued August 6, 2003).	EIS TAAM Simulation See response to Comment A-10.
A-25	See draft ALP comment B-100 issued May 21, 2003. Remove 300' of pavement prior to relocated 27L threshold and move connecting taxiway to new threshold	6.1.1.3 - The pavement located prior to the relocated Runway 27L threshold is required for aircraft taxiing to the threshold for departure operations and will be designated as a taxiway. Pavement will be marked and lighted per FAA standards in accordance with AC150/5340-1H Standards for Airport Markings, Figure 6. Marking for Taxiway Aligned with Runway.
A-26	Verify the length that critical aircraft require for departure and arrival, 12,250 feet, and the declared distance, 12,249 feet. Provide justification for the use of declared distances, such as critical aircraft. Also provide all appropriate declared distance information such as Take Off Distance Available (TODA), Take Off Run Available (TORA), and Accelerated Stop Distance Available (ASDA)	See M.P. 6.1.1.4 Runway 10C-28C Characteristics & 8.3 Airport Data Sheet for Runway 10C-28C.
A-27	"Runway 10C localizer... located east of Runway 4L/22R" should be "east of Runway 44/22L"	Revised in all subsequent documentation.
A-28	Verify runway length and provide information on TODA, TORA, and ASDA.	See response to Comment A-26
A-29	Reconcile this paragraph with the results of the City's review of the ALP comments submitted to the City on May 21 and August 6, 2003	6.6.2 - New roadways have been tunneled/depressed under aircraft movement areas where practical. The service roads located between Taxiways M and D have been planned per FAA standards and tunneling has not been determined as a requirement.

A-30	Change the reference to "Exhibit II-55" to "Exhibit II-47"	Discrepancy noted.
A-31	The study of the current Runway 9L/27R Category II/III approach capability is not part of OMP. In addition the assumptions in this paragraph are not correct, refer to the forthcoming response to Airspace Case Number 2003-AGL-0005-NRA.	Reference FAA Airspace Case No. 2003-AGL-0005 NRA Response to Collision Risk Model (CRM); Upgrade R/Ws 27L & 27R ILS to Category II/III Capability.
A-32	Do not designate runways as "primarily" arrival or departure runways	M.P. Section 6.1.1. See response to Comment A-10.
A-33	This paragraph seems to be out of place. In addition ORD does not have an approved SMGCS plan on file with the FAA	Discrepancy noted. Text revised in M.P. Section 4.1.2.8.
A-34	General comment throughout document I to change reference made to FAR (Federal Acquisition Regulations) to 14 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations)	6.0 - References changed from "FAR" to '14 CFR'
A-35	Describe what operational concerns of the runway profile are mitigated with the "flat runway" concept.	This runway profile was determined to be operationally desirable by the airport advisory sessions. However, all factors pertaining to the runway profile (including operational characteristics, cost, schedule and environmental) will be further evaluated during the engineering/ design phase.
A-36	Verify length of Runway 10C/28C.	See M.P. Section 8.3 Airport Data Sheet, Runway 10C-28C length is 10,800 feet.
A-37	Document the increase in grade affect takeoff performance	See response to Comment A-35.
A-38	Reference the lighting standards for auto parking and apron area lighting standards described in this paragraph	Lighting description has been removed from the M.P. documentation. Lighting will be addressed as part of the engineering/design phase of construction.
A-39	Why are numbers 4 and 7 highlighted? Also, what is the footnote reference for "These objects penetrate the 40:1 surface"? The text indicates all items in this chart penetrate the 40:1 surface.	6.1.1.5 - Items 1 through 9 are penetrations to the 40:1 surface. Items 4 & 7 are highlighted as controlling obstructions. Items 1 through 9 will be lowered or removed such that none of these items will penetrate the 40:1 surface.
A-40	These objects must be studied under an airspace analysis and appropriate actions must be taken.	6.1.1.5 - Airspace Analysis to be conducted.
A-41	Verify whether this approach must meet MLS or ILS TERPS standards. The approach surface should meet the 50:1 standards found in 14 CFR part 77.	6.1.1.6 - Approach must conform to FAA Order 8260.3B Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS) and FAA

***O'Hare International Airport
DRAFT #1***

		Order 6850.2A Visual Guidance Lighting Systems. Penetrations to 14 CFR Part 77 surfaces are identified and an airspace study determining if objects are hazards to navigation.
A-42	Include an exhibit that shows the South Tower shadowing if applicable	6.3.2 - A South Airport Traffic Control Tower Study will be completed prior to engineering/design phase of construction similar in scope to the "North Airport Traffic Control Tower Site Selection Study" – Final Report; September 12, 2003.
A-43	Remove Runway 14L/32R, 14R/32L and 18/36 depictions.	5.1.1.5 - Revised M.P. Exhibit V-14.
A-44	Use an airport diagram that more accurately reflects the taxiway configuration around the West Terminal Complex.	5.1.1.5 - See M.P. Section 5.1.1.5, Option 5 Characteristics, Exhibit V-14, Operating Configurations Option 5.
A-45	Improve the exhibit to more accurately show declared distances including TORA, TODA, and ASDA.	A declared distances drawing was developed for the Future ALP Set – October 2003. Also see M.P. Section 8.3 Airport Data Sheet
A-46	Add an exhibit to show the declared distance lengths on Runway 10C/28C, including Landing Distance Available (LDA), ASDA, TORA, and TODA.	See response to Comment A-45.
A-47	Change the exhibit to reflect changes made based on City's response to FAA's ALP comments.	6.6.2 - Revised M.P. Exhibit VI-2.
A-48	Change title to reflect exhibit Runway 27L.	Discrepancy noted.
A-49	Update information on gate capacity based on Note to File, OMP 2018 Gate Requirements, Ura Yvan, Ricondo & Associates - June 18, 2003 and Memo from FAA's Third Party Contractor, OMP EIS - LFA Review of OMP Gate Requirements dated July 23, 2003 and verify consistency with Project Definition Report.	Section 4.2.1 updates the explanation of the range of methodologies initially used in developing overall gate requirements. The number of gates are converted into linear apron frontage for the purpose of evaluating terminal alternatives.
A-50	The last sentence "potential range of options that might be available in each area to meet the potential gate needs of the Airport both in the timeframe envisioned in the OMP, and beyond" indicates that there will be enough gates to support the levels identified in section 3.1 past 2018. This may not be the situation based on Note to File, OMP 2018 Gate Requirements, Ura Yvan, Ricondo & Associates - June 18, 2003; Memo from FAA's Third Party Contractor, OMP EIS - LFA Review of OMP Gate Requirements dated July 23, 2003; and	Section 5.2.4 addresses the overall gate requirements in terms of linear frontage based on the gate model for 2018. This section also addresses questions raised regarding the methodologies and assumptions used in the gate model. The overall gate frontage provided is addressed in Section 5.2.4 and exceeds the requirement of Section 5.2.1 and is within the preliminary

	information provided in the Project Definition Report. Update this paragraph to reflect the most current planning.	requirements presented in Section 4.2.1.
A-51	"assuming development is allowed within the existing Runway 4L RPZ." Development is not allowed in the RPZ, why assume it here?	5.2.2.1 - Several of the initial concepts (7, 8, 9 & 10) could occur only if the runway was either closed or changed to a uni-directional runway.
A-52	Change either the exhibit titles or change the concepts to 1 through 4.	5.2 - The exhibit titles have been reconciled.
A-53	Change "bride" to "bridge"	5.2 – Comment noted.
A-54	Add information on passenger convenience, international processing, gate capacity, and in general, needs of WGP. Also address need for additional gates for 2018 and beyond.	The focus of the alternatives development was to address the overall gate requirements for 2018, Section 6.2 addresses these other issues in presentation of the preferred concept.
A-55	Explain why the switch was made from wide body jets in the WGP to Regional Jets in OMP. Why I a mix of gates that include narrow body jets and multi use gates not included?	Described in M.P. Section 6.2.2
A-56	Explain what terminal or gates are meant by the following, "As such, development of additional facilities in the Terminal Core or East Terminal Area other than those currently planned is not anticipated during the analysis period". Is this an indirect reference to WGP?	Described in M.P. Sections 6.2.1 & 6.2.2
A-57	Verify whether two or three satellites could be provided without impacting taxiway facilities planned to be retained.	5.2.4 - Only two concourses with desired pushback and taxilane areas can be accommodated on the west terminal site. The conflicting sentence has been deleted.
A-58	Rewrite paragraph to better discuss curb-front requirements for the Western Terminal and draw the conclusion that the proposed concept is able to meet and even exceed the current areas.	Detailed analysis of curb front requirements will be evaluated in the future. In regard to building area, the gross terminal requirements are in Section 4.2 and the gross area provided is in Section 6.2.
A-59	Explain why an Federal Inspection Services (FIS) is needed if there are no international arrivals in the west terminal, as discussed in paragraph 2 on this page.	The statement is related to Terminal 1, not the west terminal. The conflicting sentence has been deleted.
A-60	OMP includes portions of WGP, thus should not be sited separately in this footnote.	The gate frontage associated with existing, WGP related, and other OMP related facilities is shown in Section 5.2.
A-61a	Add discussion on gate capacity and gate development through 2030 or PAL2,	See Terminal Facilities Alternatives Analysis in M.P.

	which are the levels used in the Unconstrained Demand Analysis Report and ALP Report. At a minimum provided text that additional analysis will be required for future capacity beyond 2018.	Section 5.2
A-61b	Explain the selected East Terminal Concept? Is it WGP without Terminal 2 changes? How does the Terminal 6 RJ facility and Terminal 4 fit into the refined concept?	5.2.2.3 & 5.2.4 - The text in this section clarifies that the concourse G and K extensions, Terminal 4 and Terminal 6 as envisioned under WGP are included in the OMP. Section 5.2.4 indicates that the RJ facility studied for the East Terminal is not part of the OMP.
A-61c	Explain what role the East Terminal Complex plays in the total gate capacity, this includes NLA versus regional jets, location of aircraft, and OMP compared to WGP purpose and need.	Section 5.2.1 and Section 5.2.4 both present the additional gate requirement and the gates provided within the context of the capability provided by the proposed WGP facilities.
A-62	Show Terminal 2 changes.	Explanation that proposed changes to Terminal 2 have been removed are discussed and shown in the accompanying exhibits in Section 5.2.1.
A-63	Runway 9L appears to be shorter than in Option 5.	5.2 - The exhibits in this section are terminal area diagrams not intended to show the future runway layout.
A-64	Update the legend to reflect the types of aircraft depicted in the layout.	5.2 - The legend will be corrected to add narrow-body aircraft.
A-65	Verify the West Satellite Terminal has only three piers on the ALP versus this exhibit which shows four.	The satellite terminal was developed from alternatives described in M.P. Section 5.2.2.1 and preferred plan described in Section 6.2.3.
A-66	Add Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting (ARFF) facilities and custom facilities if appropriate.	ARFF added to M.P. Section 6.3 Support/Ancillary Facilities.
A-67	Add auto parking for customers and pilots in the General Aviation (GA)/Fixed Base Operators (FBO) facility.	Text added to M.P. Section 4.3.6.
A-68	Format text font.	Replaced with M.P. Table IV-10 (M.P. Section 4.3)
A-69	Explain in discussion text why square footage for the GA/FBO has almost doubled, but operations have basically remained the same through the planning horizon.	4.3.6 - GA facility has been relocated to a permanent location on the former military property. It is not anticipated that additional area is required beyond that which is currently provided. See M.P. Section 4.3; Table IV-10

A-70	Last sentence; "The assessments of the airline maintenance and GA/FBO facilities also demonstrate that no additional facilities are projected throughout the planning levels." According to Table IV-1, the square footage has almost doubled by 2018.	Airline maintenance requirements are projected based on airline surveys and projected growth. The table has been updated to reflect potential growth from 219 to 240 acres. See M.P. Sections 4.3 Table IV-10 and 4.3.2 Table IV-13.
A-71	Explain what numbers were used in the ratios to determine the future cargo facility requirements, especially since the current facilities exceed the current need.	4.3.1 - Requirements methodology is based on surveyed responses and impacted facilities. For non-surveyed cargo, growth of facilities is based on forecast future tonnage.
A-72	Add "ACA" after Atlantic Coast Airlines	4.3.2 - Comment noted (removed from text)
A-73	How can the Airline Ground Service Equipment (GSE) Maintenance facilities assessment be similar to airline maintenance facility assessments since GSE maintenance is based on aircraft operations and airline maintenance facility requirements are based on air	4.3.3 - Based on airline surveys, it is anticipated that no growth in GSE facilities are required.
A-74	Explain what method was used in the evaluation of the truck dock areas and auto parking, especially in reference to the statement "was performed analogous to the methodology used for the previous assessments." What previous assessments?	M.P. Section 4.3.4 describes methodology to determine future needs.
A-75	Why was DOA consulted to estimate the use of current flight kitchens on the airport? Would it not have been better to consult the airlines, especially since the flight kitchens demand is based on their needs?	See response to Comment A-74.
A-76	Update information since the FBO has relocated to the military apron	Documentation in M.P. Section 4.3.6 includes updated text.
A-77	Sentence 2; rewrite to revise grammar.	Updated in M.P. Section 6.3
A-78	Recommend pursuing this recommendation and making a part of the proposed OMP	See discussion in M.P. Section 6.4.3
A-79	Have the two facilities, the Northwest Air Cargo and FedEx Cargo facility, been determined not to be a hazard to Air Navigation by the FAA?	5.3.2, 6.1.1.5 – Planned disposition of these facilities has been included in ALPs previously submitted to the FAA.
A-80	Has it been determined that employee parking in the South Cargo Area does not pose a hazard to security?	See discussion in M.P. Section 6.4.3 TSA where appropriate, will be consulted during the engineering/design phase.

A-81	Exhibits IV-24 and IV-25 are missing from the document.	6.3.1 - See M.P. Exhibits VI-8 & VI-9.
A-82	GA/FBO do not require more space within the planning horizon than currently occupied.	4.3.6 - See response to Comment A-69.
A-83	In general the GA/FBO information throughout Section IV needs to be reviewed and updated to more accurately reflect the location and size of current and future facilities.	4.3.6 - See response to Comment A-69.
A-84	Update to reflect information presented on page IV-6 paragraph 1.	5.3.1 - See M.P. Exhibits VI-8 & VI-12.
A-85	"No other terminal curb-front changes are proposed under OMP." How is WGP incorporated in OMP? It is included in the proposed ALP and listed in the phases as part of OMP. Will there be curb-front changes with the addition of Terminal 4 and 6, as well as there are changes shown to Terminal 5 on the ALP.	Revised text contained in Section 5.4.1 identifies the WGP curbfront development that is retained in the Master Plan.
A-86	Change and verify the existing ratio of "10,150" to 10,147" and the (780-foot) curb-front to Terminal 1 to (779-foot) in accordance with footnote on page III-10.	See M.P. Section 5.4.1
A-87	Will two sets of three lanes give you the ability to separate departing traffic according to regional roads (in reference to last sentence of the paragraph)?	Revised text is contained in M.P. Section 5.4.2.
A-88	List the other WGP Roadway Concepts	Revised text in Section 5.4.2.5 addresses this comment.
A-89	General comment: clarify what portions of WGP are part of OMP and which ones are not. Discuss why each portion was or was not included. Also discuss the WGP components affect on the overall capacity and efficiency of OMP.	Section 5.4.2.5 provides updated text to respond to this comment.
A-90	Verify with surface transportation sub-group that 900 inbound trips and 800 outbound trips are appropriate	This requirement is discussed in M.P. Section 4.4.1.
A-91	Discuss in this section how western access will be provided to the entire airport	Described in M.P. Section 5.4.2.1.
A-92	Concept 2 and 3; Airfield Impacts; if I-190 does not have security requirements currently when it is on airport property, why would the north/south roadway located on airport property have security requirements?	5.4.2.4 - Agree with FAA comment, revised text removes this evaluation finding.
A-93	Off Airport Impacts; has the 300 feet reserved for the Western Bypass been verify as adequate space and if so, by what agency?	See M.P. Section 5.4.2.1.
A-94	Fix grammar	Revised text in Section 5.4.2.2.

A-95	Remove footnote on "Left Turn Lanes at Signalized Intersections"	Revised in M.P. Section 5.4.2.2 Table V-15.
A-96	Add environmental impacts on streams, which is caused by Concept IP-3.	Revised in M.P. Section 5.4.2.2 Table V-15.
A-97	Review road around Runway 9L, which is the preferred concept to make sure it does not affect western by-pass, does not penetrate approach surface, and that traffic will not backup in RPZ.	Revised in M.P. Section 5.4.2.3.
A-98	Verify Bessie Coleman flyover ramps do not affect Part 77 surfaces and Bessie Coleman is out of RSA.	Described in M.P. Sections 5.4.2.4 & 5.4.2.5.
A-99	Concept 1 through 4; identify impacts on the RPZ and if any entrance or exit ramps penetrate the 14 CFR part 77 surfaces as discussed in Concept 4.	Concepts have been refined, alternative option selected. Impacts on RPZ are depicted on Future ALP. See M.P. Section 5.4.2.4.
A-100	Provide information on why no I-190 realignment was considered under OMP.	Described in M.P. Section 5.4.2.4.
A-101	Identify what capacity improvements are to be made to I-190.	Described in M.P. Section 5.4.2.4.
A-102	Identify how Terminal 4 will be accessed.	Described in M.P. Section 5.4.2.5.
A-103	Explain how the percentage split between east and west terminals was determined (84 and 16 percent), review this information based on 2002 gate schedules.	Described in M.P. Section 5.4.4.1.
A-104	Explain in text where the assumptions in the table were determined, especially the split between short and long-term parking and the area for the parking stalls.	Described in M.P. Sections 4.4.2 & 5.4.3.
A-105	The Preferred Concept, see ALP Comment submitted to the City on May 21, 2003.	5.4.3.3, 6.4.2 and Future ALP October 2003 - ATS Station / Parking in Extended OFA to be closed.
A-106	Are Transportation Security Administration (TSA) employees considered in the employee parking requirements? If they are they need to be discussed in the text.	In total, the plan provides 15,204 parking stalls airport-wide, more than adequate to accommodate TSA employees as part of the airport employee requirements. See M.P. Section 5.4.4.
A-107	Explain how it was determined to use 300 and 325 square feet for stall area, especially when table V-3 used 325 square feet for structure and 350 square feet for surface parking.	Described in M.P. Section 4.4.2.
A-108	Explain in text how the stall numbers were determined for the east and west terminals. Also, verify these assumptions are valid with the surface transportation working group.	Described in M.P. Section 5.4.3.

A-109	The footnote in table V-6 states that United Airlines and American Airlines have approximately 6,467 stalls in the northwest maintenance area. Verify why this table only shows a requirement of 3,121 employee-parking stalls in the northwest maintenance area.	See discussion in M.P. Section 5.4.4.2.
A-110	Removing parking from the northwest maintenance area should be a Department of Aviation Goal in the time frame of the OMP development	6.4.3 - See response to Comment A-109.
A-111	Verify that new ATS station and blue line connection is still proposed under OMP	Described in M.P. Section 5.4.8.1.
A-112	General comment on Section V; when making assumptions about passenger and employee parking, why is it assumed that after 2014, demand on the east side will be met? Will the east side terminals reach capacity after 2014? Discussion areas include, but are not limited to, page V-26 and Table V-11.	Described in M.P. Section 5.4.4.1.
A-113	Why do the northwest maintenance area employees parking stalls reflect in-kind replacement of existing parking stalls? Is there no forecasted growth for those tenants that currently use that area or will they be accommodated in other areas of the airport?	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 5.4.4.3.
A-114	Preferred Concept; verify that the four story rental car facility is located outside the RPZ, extended OFA and that the facility is not a 14 CFR part 77 violation.	Rental Car Facility is outside OFA and RPZ. CFR Part 77 evaluation will be performed during facility engineering/ design phase.
A-115	There will need to be a security check point for screening of commercial vehicles on the West Terminal complex access road, as is available on the east side.	Discussion provided in M.P. Sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 Tables VI-4 and VI-5.
A-116	Preferred Secure APM Concept; provide discussion of the capacity of the secured automatic people mover (APM). What is the flow through of people between the East and West Terminal Complexes, how many cars will be available, and what is the wait time for passengers?	Discussion provided in M.P. Sections 5.5 and 6.5.
A-117	Provide discussion and options for passengers who arrive at the West Terminal and do not have ability to check bags because airline facilities are unavailable, thus the passenger is unable to get through security to gain access to the secured APM.	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 5.5.2.3.
A-118	Determine if the airport transit system (ATS) cause a 14 CFR part 77 violation. Please review and provide a more detailed discussion if necessary.	6.5 & Future ALP - ATS Station currently in the proposed Runway 9C-27C extended OFA to be closed.

***O'Hare International Airport
DRAFT #1***

A-119	Add passengers who have checked baggage on airlines that only serve the east terminal complex to the list of people that would use the ATS.	Discussion provided in M.P. Sections 5.5.2 and 6.5.
A-120	In accordance with AC 150/5300-13, Airport Design, the bridge width must be the width of the runway or taxiway plus safety area. Thus the width of the bridge for Runway 4L/22R, must be a minimum of 500 feet wide.	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 5.5.2.2.
A-121	Show diagram of the route the shuttle will take when operating on local roadways.	Shuttle route illustrated in Exhibit V-122
A-122	Parking facilities, including long-term parking lots, must be taken into consideration in this bus route. At a minimum discuss how passengers from the West Terminal, who parked in the East Terminal long-term parking lot, will access their vehicle.	Discussion provided in M.P. Sections 5.5.2.3 and 6.5.
A-123	Verify 8 buses will be adequate to provide service every 10 minutes at each stop, including long-term parking lots.	Discussion provided in M.P. Sections 5.5.2.3.
A-124	Verify that Metra connection at the West Terminal Complex reference is the same as Metra's proposed STAR Line.	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 5.4.8.2.
A-125	The reference to CTA seems to be out of place. It should be incorporated into section 5.9.1.	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 5.4.8.1.
A-126	General Comment, Appendix A; include this information in the Unconstrained Demand Analysis Report. (This has been discussed with the FAA's Third Party Contractor.)	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 3.4.3
A-127	General Comment, Appendix A; reevaluate the use of forecast date of 2022. In order to be consistent with all other planning information, we recommend the use of 2018, or PAL1 or PAL2.	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 3.4.3
A-128	Explain how it was determined the international carriers would increase their share of enplaned belly cargo and thus causing an increase in the overall average of enplaned cargo tonnage.	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 3.4.3
A-129	Include apron, hangar, and customer parking in description of needs.	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 4.3.1 and Table IV-11.
A-130	"Although approximately 12 percent of cargo is processed off-airport, thus not requiring warehouse, cargo..." this inders the calculations in the sentence prior includes a 12 percent reduction. If this is correct, the second to last sentence of	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 4.3.1 and Table IV-11.

	this paragraph is incorrect or need to be verified. It indicates table B-3, which lists the exact amount, as the sentence above, does not take the 12 percent reduction into consideration when calculating peak month total enplaned cargo.	
A-131	Is there a need to include ARFF in future airport maintenance DOA future facility requirements?	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 4.3.5.
A-132	Verify the need to relocated the GA/FBO from it's present relocated site, due to the construction of Runway 10C/28C. In addition, review fractional ownership industry trends when determining facilities required such as customer parking and apron space available.	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 4.3.6.
A-133a	Refers to moving the parking area outside of the secured area near the Mount Prospect Road entrance. This would be a positive step towards improved security. Employees could be screened prior to boarding employee buses, which bring them to their work sites within the secured area, which would then be redefined as a result of the OMP. A structure could house a screening facility in this parking area, thus preventing unscreened individuals from entering the airfield.	Discussion provided in M.P. Section 5.4.4.
A-133b	Concept 2 describes a north/south roadway bisecting the airport that would provide access to the West Terminal. Opening a public access road anywhere on airport property will require consideration of an area where vehicles can stop and be searched under certain security conditions. Any concept that includes a public road, which brings vehicle traffic closer to aircraft, will not be supported by TSA security.	Discussion provided in M.P. Sections 5.4.2.2 and 6.4.
A-133c	Until TSA Security requirements for airfield and terminal access become further defined, only security concepts can be discussed. However, planning for the construction of screening structures must be considered, regardless of whether the proposed plans address passengers, employees, or layers of preventive measures.	TSA where appropriate, will be consulted during the engineering/ design phase.

PROJECT DEFINITION REPORT

General Note: *FAA comment text has been abbreviated. For comment in its entirety please see Appendix D, FAA "Master Plan Review" of September 6, 2004. All sections referenced in the "Response" column pertain to the O'Hare International Airport Master Plan (MP)*

Reference No.	Comment	Response
B-1	Discuss what the wind coverage will be with the east west configuration and with and without the 4/22 Runways.	Wind coverage is described in Master Plan (M.P.) Section 4.1.2.1 Exhibit IV-8 and Table IV-3.
B-2	Discuss the critical aircraft and the length required for those aircraft.	Described in M.P. Section 4.1.2.2
B-3	Under the proposed configuration not all runways are designated for Aircraft Design Group (ADG) V aircraft. There are numerous restrictions that must be discussed and should be mentioned in this section. (See Draft ALP comment A-48 issued May 21, 2003.)	6.1 - While all runways will be designated for ADG-V use, certain ADG-V aircraft may be operationally restricted from using a runway depending upon payload and environmental conditions. Air Traffic restrictions are defined in the TAAM simulation effort. Taxiway restrictions are also referenced in the FAA letter of April 8, 2004 to the City titled "Runway/Parallel Taxiway Separation Guidance & Update on the Status of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13; Change 8".
B-4	"The length of this will satisfy landing and departure runway length requirements for ADG IV and smaller for the majority of domestic markets." As described earlier, all runways are designed for ADG V, thus why will this runway not meet the requirements of a majority of the ADG V and smaller landing and departure runway lengths required. Also, what percentage is a majority?	Described in M.P. Sections 4.1.2.2 and 6.1.1.1.
B-5	Discuss the taxi restriction of ADG V aircraft, as provided in ALP comments and FAA/City Airport Layout Plan (ALP) working sessions. (See Draft ALP comment A-48 issued May 21, 2003.)	For aircraft restrictions reference FAA letter of April 8, 2004 to the City titled "Runway/Parallel Taxiway Separation Guidance & Update on the Status of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13; Change 8".
B-6	Explain why the dual ADG V taxiways around the north side of the east terminal area were not included as part of OMP, since it was a recommendation of the 1991 Delay Task Force. (See Draft ALP comment D-1 issued May 21, 2003.)	Described in M.P. Section 6.1.1.2 paragraph 2.

Reference	No. Comment	Response
B-7	See Draft ALP comment B-96 issued May 21, 2003.	6.1.1.2 - ATS station to be closed.
B-8	See Draft ALP comment A-48 issued May 21, 2003.	See response to Comment B-5.
B-9	See Draft ALP comment A-48 issued May 21, 2003.	See response to Comment B-5.
B-10	In the first sentence change "22R" to "22L"	Revised.
B-11	See Draft ALP comment A-42 issued May 21, 2003.	Described in M.P. Sections 6.1.1.5 and 8.3 and ALP Runway Data Table
B-12	Verify the length of Runway 10C/28C and provide justification and all information pertaining to declared distances. (See Draft ALP comment A-43 issued May 21, 2003.)	6.1.1.5 - See response to Comment B-11.
B-13	See Draft ALP comment D-3 issued May 21, 2003.	6.1.1.5 – CFR Part 77 identifies 45 light pole penetrations to the approach surface. Of these, 9 light poles also penetrate TERPS Obstacle Clearance Surfaces. The nine poles penetrating TERPS surface will need to be lowered or removed.
B-14	See Draft ALP comment D-4 issued May 21, 2003.	6.1.1.5 - Subsequent to modeling airfield operations for the Master Plan, TAAM modeling was used for EIS simulation in accordance with FAA and addresses the most recent Air Traffic procedures.
B-15	See Draft ALP comment D-5 and D-6 issued May 21, 2003.	6.1.1.6 - Runway 10R-28L runway end elevations are shown to conform to FAA TERPS criteria. Runway end elevations for RW 10R-28L will be reviewed/refined during the project's design/engineering phase. As part of the design phase, a detailed engineering study will include operational characteristics, cost, schedule and environmental in determining optimal runway end elevations.
B-16	Add information pertaining to Runway 4L/22R and 4R/22L to the runway descriptions	Described in M.P. Section 6.1.

Reference No.	Comment	Response
B-17	Describe how the other 10 of the 14 potential runway-operating plans will be used if only four are considered primary configurations, high wind, snow removal, runway maintenance, etc.	See response to Comment B-14 and the latest EIS TAAM Data Package.
B-18	Verify footnote relevance after Collision Risk Model results are provided by FAA for Runway 9L/27R and Taxiway H.	6.1.1.3 - See response to Comment B-5.
B-19	Review taxi flow configurations and runway usage based on Draft ALP comments issued August 6, 2003.	See response to Comment B-17
B-20	Describe where and how the taxi flows are designed to reduce runway crossings.	See response to Comment B-17
B-21	Review NLA taxiway routes based on Draft ALP comments issued May 21 and August 6, 2003.	Described in M.P. Section 6.1.1.7 and Exhibit VI-3.
B-22	See Draft ALP comments D-9 and D-10 issued May 21, 2003.	6.2. - Roadway development part of a separate study in conjunction with the EIS; Exhibit revised to reflect 213' for pushback area
B-23	Verify the location of NLA and wide body aircraft gates, the need for FIS in Terminal 5 and the West Terminal Complex, and the location of regional jet and narrow body jet aircraft. Do the locations enhance passenger convenience and efficiency? Do the types of gates and their locations match the need of tenants?	Described in M.P. Section 6.2
B-24	See Draft ALP comment D-12 issued May 21, 2003.	6.2.3, Future ALP October 2003 - The parking lot is located adjacent to and northeast of the relocated Bensenville Ditch
B-25	Update table based on Note to File, OMP 2018 Gate Requirements, Ura Yvan, Ricondo & Associates - June 18, 2003 and Memo from FAA's Third Party Contractor, OMP EIS - LFA Review of OMP Gate Requirements dated July 23, 2003 and verify consistency with Concept Development/Refinement Report.	Described in M.P. Section 5.2.1
B-26	Provide information on how vehicles are moved across Runway 10L/28R, if applicable.	6.6.2. - Reference: "Airfield Service Road Traffic Study" November 2003.
B-27	Will the development meet TERPS standards?	6.3.2 – Facilities will be planned to protect all TERPS surfaces. Ultimate configuration of facilities will be

Reference No.	Comment	Response
		determined during engineering/ design phase.
B-28	Provide current and proposed cargo facilities, so comparison of impact can be made.	Described in M.P. Section 6.3.2 and Table VI-4.
B-29	Explain to what extent facility replacement may change.	Described in M.P. Section 6.3.1
B-30	Verify consistency of symbol usage on exhibits. Guard posts are depicted using a green triangle.	6.3.1 - Exhibit VI-8
B-31	Will the sanitary unit be relocated? Is this the proper location in the text to discuss the sanitary unit?	Described in M.P. Section 6.3.1
B-32	In the last sentence change "additional" to "addition".	6.3.1 - Text updated.
B-33	Include discussion of proposed western by-pass that will be located on airport property, according to Concept Development/Refinement Report and numerous newspaper articles.	Described in M.P. Sections 6.4.1.1 and 6.4.1.2.
B-34	See Draft ALP comment B-97 issued May 21, 2003, pertaining to parking in the RPZ and extended OFA.	Described in M.P. Section 6.1.1.2 paragraph 3 and Future ALP 2003 – ATS station within the extended OFA to be closed.
B-35	Provide description on un-secure access between the West and East Terminal Complexes and the long-term parking. This should include the method used for transportation including route, capacity and demand of the facility, and passengers and tenants that will use the facility.	Described in M.P. Section 6.5.
B-36	See Draft ALP comment A-41 issued May 21, 2003.	Described in M.P. Section 6.7.2 and Exhibits VI-13 thru VI-16. Avigation Easements have been depicted on Future ALP - October 2003.
B-37	General Comment, section 9; provide additional detailed information on the phasing process, such as what remains in operation, what items must be altered, if certain portions of the airport must change use in order to accommodate construction, etc.	Description in M.P. Section 7, Implementation Plan.
B-38	Operational Impacts; must partially close Runway 14R/32L.	Description in M.P. Section 7.1.3.

Reference	No. Comment	Response
B-39	Operational Assumptions; Category II/III capability is a recommendation of the Delay Task Force, not a requirement of OMP.	Description in M.P. Section 7.1.3, Phase 1C.
B-40	WS-3; change may to must. If the APM is not built prior to the development of the West Satellite Concourse, how will people be transported between the West and East Terminal Complexes?	Description in M.P. Section 6.5.
B-41	Operational Assumptions; Category II/III capability is a recommendation of the Delay Task Force, not a requirement of OMP.	Description in M.P. Section 7.1.4, Phase 1.
B-42	Operational Assumptions; bullet 3; restoration of Runway 28R Category II/III capability should be found in Phase 1B.	Description in M.P. Section 7.1.4, Phase 1.
B-43	Operational Assumptions, bullet 4; provide a better description of runway length requirements. There will not be 13,000 feet available at all times on runway 10L/28R due to the protection of Taxiway Q and Runway 4R/22L.	Description in M.P. Section 7.1.4, Phase 1.
B-44	Operational Assumptions, bullet 4; change reference to "22R" to 28R".	Revised text in M.P. Section 7.1.4.
B-45	General Comment; provide justification for 13,000 feet of runway length	Justification in M.P. Section 4.1.2.2, paragraph 3.
B-46	2B-4; is the ultimate relocation of all employees' parking from within the northwest maintenance area to an area outside of the Airport Operations Area still a consideration? This would be a preferred alternative.	Description in M.P. Section 6.4.3.
B-47	See Draft ALP comments pertaining to runway/taxiway separation requirements and runway safety area requirements. If any portion of the airport does not meet FAA design standards the Airport must request a Modification to Standards and provide justification. If a runway safety area does not meet standards a practicability study must be completed.	6.9 - Response to ALP Comments document details of existing and proposed operational restrictions, waivers and modification of standards (MOS). For RSA reference "Chicago O'Hare International Airport Runway 4R-22L Safety Area Practicability Study" - May 4, 2004; For runway/ taxiway separation restrictions reference FAA letter of April 8, 2004 to the City titled "Runway/Parallel Taxiway Separation Guidance & Update on the Status of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13; Change 8". Additionally, any non-standard condition determined during the engineering/ design phase will be coordinated with the FAA as soon as information becomes available. NCP waivers will be

Reference		
No.	Comment	Response
		requested as appropriate.

AIRSIDE SIMULATION ANALYSIS

General Note: Except for a few comments below, the majority of the comments on this document can be found in the Draft ALP comments submitted on August 6, 2003. For the following comments, FAA comment text has been abbreviated. For comment in its entirety please see Appendix D, FAA "Master Plan Review" of September 6, 2004. All sections referenced in the "Response" column pertain to the O'Hare International Airport Master Plan (MP)

Reference No.	Comment	Response
C-1	Throughout the document, incorporate information based on the use of the 2002 Terminal Area Forecast (TAF).	3.1 - Subsequent to modeling for purposes of the Master Plan, TAAM modeling was used for purposes of the EIS. The EIS modeling incorporates the most recent Air Traffic assumptions and FAA forecasts.
C-2	Discuss the assumptions used to determine the seats per departure.	Assumptions described in Master Plan (M.P.) Section III.
C-3	Review general aviation operations based on 2002 TAF. (See Draft ALP comment B-8 issued August 6, 2003).	3.4.4 - See response to Comment C-1.
C-4	Add text describing how gate availability was used in the TAAM simulation model.	See response to Comment C-1.
C-5	Provide information on how precipitation will affect land and hold short operations (LAHSO) and thus affect throughput of the airport.	See response to Comment C-1.
C-6	Moving the runway 400 feet north may have allowed free flow of aircraft to gates that were determined restricted based on the FAA's collision risk model (CRM), thus may have materially changed the airfield/airspace. Please evaluate this assumption.	See response to Comment C-1.
C-7	How many gates were used in the TAAM model to provide sufficient capacity for the runways? Is this number considered in the proposed plan? How does this number correspond with the information provided in the Project Definition Report and the Concept Development/Refinement Report?	See response to Comment C-1.
C-8	According to the Project Definition Report and the Concept Development/Refinement Report, 12,000 feet for Runway 28R would not meet	6.1.1.4 - Future Runway 10L-28R 13,000 feet.

Reference	No. Comment	Response
	the needs of users.	
C-9	The 400-foot runway/taxiway separation on the east end of Runway 28 is not shown on the current approved ALP, however the dual taxiways are. There is a service road shown that creates the 400 feet separation that was not included in the World Gateway Program.	Described in M.P. Section 6.1.1.4 paragraph 3.
C-10	According to the Project Definition Report and the Concept Development/Refinement Report, 12,000 feet for Runway 28R would not meet the needs of users.	See response to Comment C-8.
C-11	Change "1,200 feet" to "1,607 feet".	Revised text in M.P. Section 6.1.1.2
C-12	The 400-foot runway/taxiway separation on the east end of Runway 28 is not shown on the current approved ALP, however the dual taxiways are. There is a service road shown that creates the 400 feet separation that was not included in the World Gateway Program.	See response to Comment C-9.
C-13	The 400-foot runway/taxiway separation on the east end of Runway 28R is not shown on the current approved ALP, however the dual taxiways are. There is a service road shown that creates the 400 feet separation that was not included in the World Gateway Program.	See response to Comment C-9.
C-14	Verify the length of Runway 10C/28C and coordinate with the Project Definition Report and the Concept Development/Refinement Report.	Described in M.P. Section 6.1.1.5
C-15	Provide information or documentation on if and how NLA was taken into consideration when developing the arrival and departure traffic flows, based on only certain runways and taxiways are being designed to handle this size of aircraft.	6.1.1.7 - See response to Comment C-1.
C-16	Last sentence; provide information on how it was determined that the effects of the additional airspace changes are estimated to be of significantly less impact than the addition of the new runways.	See response to Comment C-1.
C-17	Provide additional information on the relationship between OMP and the National Airspace Review (NAR). (See Draft ALP comment B-90 issued August 6, 2003.)	See response to Comment C-1.
C-18	Verify the Option 5 graphic is correct. The graph appears to be incorrect based on	See response to Comment C-1.

Reference		Response
No.	Comment	
	the numbers found in table VI-2, which shows 10.2 minutes of delay shown in the table versus approximately 7 minutes of delay shown in the graph.	
C-19	Explain in this section how gate delay was determined for Option 1 and Option 5, especially since it was discussed on pages IV-1, 4, and 8 that a full gate capacity was provided for the simulations in order to allow for a full analysis of the airfield capacity without gate constraints. What number of gates was used to determine gate capacity and provide information on the number of gates required for OMP to gain the benefits of the proposed runway configuration?	See response to Comment C-1.
C-20	Update information on gate capacity based on Note to File, OMP 2018 Gate Requirements, Ura Yvan, Ricondo & Associates - June 18, 2003 and Memo from FAA's Third Party Contractor, OMP EIS - LFA Review of OMP Gate Requirements dated July 23, 2003 and verify consistency with Project Definition Report and the Concept Development/Refinement Report.	See response to Comment C-1.

GENERAL COMMENTS

FAA General Comments are contained in Appendix D, FAA "Master Plan Review" of September 6, 2004.

All sections referenced in the "Response" column pertain to the O'Hare International Airport Master Plan (MP)

Reference No.	Comment	Response
D-1	Provide an OMP financial plan, which includes a discussion of what role/priority OMP plays in the Chicago O'Hare Capital Improvement Plan, funding sources (AIP, PFC, entitlements, discretionary, bonds, others), and amounts.	Financial plan is described in Master Plan (M.P.) Section 7.4.
D-2	Develop a cost benefit analysis for OMP.	This will be included as part of the LOI application process.
D-3	Provide documentation on the economic impact of OMP on the City of Chicago and the region.	See response to Comment D-2.
D-4	Discuss further how the goals and objectives of the OMP and the WGP work together to provide an overall more efficient and beneficial airport.	Plan is described in M.P. Sections 6.2 and 6.3. Implementation and funding is discussed in M.P. Sections 7.1, 7.2, 7.3.
D-5	Provide documentation describing the existing conditions and issues. This includes an airport inventory and an assessment of pertinent airport-related issues and operational constraints.	Airport Inventory is described in M.P. Section 2. Operational constraints are covered in the TAAM simulation.
D-6	Provide a discussion of the City's public outreach program.	Information provided to the FAA separately.
D-7	Provide a discussion of compatible land-use such as zoning, RPZ acquisition, and public interest. (See Draft ALP comment A-41 issued May 21, 2003.)	Discussed in M.P. Section 2.10
D-8	Provide discussion of airport capacity and delay based on 2002 Terminal Area Forecasts. This discussion should include information on constrained and unconstrained airfield capacity, delay numbers that compare a build and no build scenario, and other capacity and delay issues, such as runway versus airfield delay	Subsequent to modeling for purposes of the Master Plan, TAAM modeling was used for purposes of the EIS. The EIS modeling incorporates the most recent Air Traffic assumptions and FAA forecasts.

Reference		
No.	Comment	Response
	numbers, as appropriate.	assumptions and FAA forecasts.

